REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are cancelled without prejudice and applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter in those claims in any forthcoming continuation applications. Claims 22-25 are amended and claims 26-37 are new. Applicants believe that the current Office Action overlooks, generalizes and disregards the purpose, functionality and significance of the Personal Unique Identifier ("PUID"). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview Dated August 20, 2008

An interview was held on August 20, 2008. Applicants believe that an agreement was reached that the current changes overcome the references.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-14, 16-17 and 19-22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,181,781 issued to Porter et al. (hereinafter "Porter") in view of "Ring Central Products: PhoneWorks 2002" (hereinafter "PhoneWorks"). Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Phone Works and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,185 issued to Guthrie et al. (hereinafter "Guthrie") Applicants respectfully disagree. For simplicity of explanation, applicants will first discuss the advantageous features associated with the PUID as set forth in the specification.

As background, and not for limiting the claims in any manner, the specification recites an example as follows:

> The subscriber's personal information is stored in notification server 304. *Notification server 304 generates a personal unique identifier (PUID) to identify the subscriber such that the PUID correlates to a corresponding identifier.* *Specification* at page 6, lines 12-14 (emphasis added).

> Notification server 304 *provides a link between the identifier associated with the event and the PUID associated with the subscriber.* The telephone carrier uses the identifier, such as the subscriber's phone number, to identify an event. *Notification server 304 uses the PUID to identify the subscriber.* Notification server 304 is not aware of the subscriber associated with the identifier. When an

event occurs at voice mail switch 308, *notification server 304 correlates the identifier associated with the event to the corresponding PUID and then forwards the event to the PUID*. Likewise, the telephone carrier does not store any PUID information. Thus, notification server 304 can bridge voice mail switch 308 to web service interface 302 *by mapping the subscriber's telephone number to the corresponding PUID*. *Specification* at page 7, lines 20-30 (emphasis added).

Notification server 304 has a set of subscriber-defined settings that determine where the alerts are sent. *For example, the subscriber can elect to receive alerts at a computer in the form of an instant message that appears as a pop-up window on the computer screen when the subscriber is on-line. If the subscriber is off-line, the subscriber can have the alerts forwarded to a voice mailbox that is accessed by a different number than the phone number associated with the voice mailbox where the message was left. Alternatively, the alerts can be deposited in the subscriber's e-mail inbox in the form of a text message. The alerts can be delivered to any destination by any communication method designated by the subscriber at web service interface* 302. *Specification* at page 7, lines 11-19 (emphasis added).

The telephone carrier and web service interface 302 each recognize the subscriber via different string values, i.*e., a phone number and a PUID*. This feature *provides the subscriber with flexibility in customizing the alerts service because notification server 304 can map one or more phone numbers to one or more PUIDs. For example, the subscriber can receive alerts at one location for events occurring at many different voice mail switches. Likewise, a subscriber can receive the same alert at more than one location. Furthermore, multiple subscribers can be notified of the same event. For example, an entire family can be simultaneously notified of voice mail messages left at their residential line*. *Specification* at page 8, lines 1-9 (emphasis added).

The specification makes the functionality and the advantages of the PUID clear. The PUID is not subscriber information. The specification makes clear that the PUID is generated *to identify* the stored subscriber information. The PUID *provides a mapping between a stored mailbox identifier and a mailbox identifier that is received on the notification server*. The PUID provides an intermediary between the mapping of the mailbox and the subscriber profile so that a subscriber can utilize a rich mapping system that includes a wide range of versatility. The cited references do not teach or otherwise suggest these features or the functionality of the PUID in any manner.

Independent claim 22 recites "storing, on the notification server, the mailbox registration information and the subscriber profile information, wherein the mailbox registration information includes a mailbox identifier for each of the plurality of mailboxes, *wherein a personal unique identifier (PUID) is generated on the notification server to map the stored mailbox identifiers for each of the plurality of mailboxes with the subscriber profile information*." The current Office Action acknowledges that the PUID is distinct from Porter's mailbox number. However the Office Action argues that Porter teaches a user profile that reads on the PUID. Porter actually teaches a "subscriber profile." *Porter* at col. 2, lines 47-49. As indicated in independent claim 22, claim 22 distinguishes the subscriber profile information from the PUID. The PUID is generated to map the stored mailbox identifiers for each of the plurality of mailboxes with the subscriber profile information. Accordingly, the PUID cannot be the same as subscriber profile information in that the PUID is generated to map the subscriber profile information. Stated another way, they are different and separate features that provide different functionality. In Porter, the message is associated with the mailbox of the received mailbox identifier. There is no mapping utilizing a PUID. Again, Porter's direct relation to the mailbox cannot provide the rich mapping functionality identified above. With regard to PhoneWorks, PhoneWorks teaches allowing fax, e-mail, and voice mail messages to come together in one common "in-box." PhoneWorks teaches that the voicemail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes. PhoneWorks also teaches notification and forwarding rules. Yet, PhoneWorks does not teach how any of these features occur. The Office Action speculates as to how the functionality of PhoneWorks occurs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in PhoneWorks of a PUID and/or the features and functionality of the PUID as indicated in the claim.

Independent claim 22 also recites "*matching, on the notification server, the received mailbox identifier to one of the stored mailbox identifiers of the mailbox registration information to identify the generated PUID that maps the stored mailbox identifiers for each of the plurality of mailboxes with the subscriber profile information*." In Porter, the subscriber information is associated with the mailbox itself. As indicated here, the received mailbox identifier is matched to a stored mailbox identifier. Yet, the claim continues by indicating that

the matching identifies the generated PUID. The identified PUID allows "*accessing subscriber profile information associated with the generated PUID to identify a delivery channel associated with the subscriber profile information*." The PUID identifies the subscriber profile information. Again, the PUID allows for the rich mapping capabilities. This is not taught in any manner in Porter. The claim language makes clear that the subscriber profile is different than the PUID. With regard to PhoneWorks, applicants cannot find any teaching or suggestion of a PUID that includes the features as indicated in the claim.

Independent claim 22 further recites "sending the plurality of alerts via the delivery channel indicated in the *subscriber profile information that is identified by the generated PUID*." In Porter, the subscriber profile information is not identified by the generated PUID. Again, the direct mapping of Porter does not provide the rich mapping and versatility as indicated above. With regard to PhoneWorks, applicants cannot find any teaching or suggestion of a PUID that includes the features as indicated in the claim. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 22 is allowable.

Independent claim 26 recites "storing the mailbox identifier information and the subscriber profile information, *wherein a personal unique identifier (PUID) is generated to map the stored mailbox identifier with the subscriber profile information*." The current Office Action acknowledges that the PUID is distinct from Porter's mailbox number. However the Office Action argues that Porter teaches a user profile that reads on the PUID. Porter actually teaches a "subscriber profile." *Porter* at col. 2, lines 47-49. As indicated in independent claim 26, claim 26 distinguishes the subscriber profile information from the PUID. The PUID is generated to map the stored mailbox identifiers for each of the plurality of mailboxes with the subscriber profile information. Accordingly, the PUID cannot be the same as subscriber profile information in that the PUID is generated to map the subscriber profile information. Stated another way, they are different and separate features that provide different functionality. In Porter, the message is associated with the mailbox of the received mailbox identifier. There is no mapping utilizing a PUID. Again, Porter's direct relation to the mailbox cannot provide the rich mapping functionality identified above. With regard to PhoneWorks, PhoneWorks teaches allowing fax, e-mail, and voice mail messages to come together in one common "in-box."

11

PhoneWorks teaches that the voicemail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes. PhoneWorks also teaches notification and forwarding rules. Yet, PhoneWorks does not teach how any of these features occur. The Office Action speculates as to how the functionality of PhoneWorks occurs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in PhoneWorks of a PUID and/or the features and functionality of the PUID as indicated in the claim.

Independent claim 26 also recites "*matching the received mailbox identifier to the stored mailbox identifier to identify the generated PUID that maps the stored mailbox identifier with the subscriber profile information*." In Porter, the subscriber information is associated with the mailbox itself. As indicated here, the received mailbox identifier is matched to a stored mailbox identifier. Yet, the claim continues by indicated that the matching identifies the generated PUID. The identified PUID allows "*accessing the subscriber profile information based on the identified generated PUID*." The PUID identifies the subscriber profile information. Again, the PUID allows for the rich mapping capabilities. This is not taught in any manner in Porter. The claim language makes clear that the subscriber profile is different than the PUID. With regard to PhoneWorks, applicants cannot find any teaching or suggestion of a PUID that includes the features as indicated in the claim.

Independent claim 26 further recites "*sending the alert via the at least one communication channel indicated in the subscriber profile information that is identified by the generated PUID*." In Porter, the subscriber profile information is not identified by the generated PUID. Again, the direct mapping of Porter does not provide the rich mapping and versatility as indicated above. With regard to PhoneWorks, applicants cannot find any teaching or suggestion of a PUID that includes the features as indicated in the claim. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claim 34 recites "storing, on the notification server, the mailbox registration information and the first and second subscriber profile information, wherein the mailbox registration information includes a mailbox identifier for the first and second mailboxes, *wherein a first personal unique identifier (PUID) is generated on the notification server to map the first stored mailbox identifier to the first subscriber profile, wherein a second PUID is*

12

generated on the notification server to map the second stored mailbox identifier to the second subscriber profile." The current Office Action acknowledges that the PUID is distinct from Porter's mailbox number. However the Office Action argues that Porter teaches a user profile that reads on the PUID. Porter actually teaches a "subscriber profile." *Porter* at col. 2, lines 47-49. As indicated in independent claim 34, claim 34 distinguishes the first and second subscriber profile information from the first and second PUID. The first and second PUID are generated to map the stored mailbox identifiers with the subscriber profile information. Accordingly, the first and second PUID cannot be the same as subscriber profile information in that the first and second PUID are generated to map the subscriber profile information. Stated another way, they are different and separate features that provide different functionality. In Porter, the message is associated with the mailbox of the received mailbox identifier. There is no mapping utilizing a PUID. Again, Porter's direct relation to the mailbox cannot provide the rich mapping functionality identified above. With regard to PhoneWorks, PhoneWorks teaches allowing fax, e-mail, and voice mail messages come together in one common "in-box." PhoneWorks teaches that the voicemail system supports an unlimited number of voice mailboxes. PhoneWorks also teaches notification and forwarding rules. Yet, PhoneWorks does not teach how any of these features occur. The Office Action speculates as to how the functionality of PhoneWorks occurs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in PhoneWorks of PUIDs and/or the features and functionality of the PUIDs as indicated in the claim.

Independent claim 34 also recites "*matching, on the notification server, the received mailbox identifier to the mailbox identifier for the first mailbox to identify the generated first PUID that maps the stored first mailbox identifier with the first subscriber profile information,*" in combination with "*matching, on the notification server, the received mailbox identifier to the mailbox identifier for the second mailbox to identify the generated second PUID that maps the stored second mailbox identifier with the second subscriber profile information.*" In Porter, the subscriber information is associated with the mailbox itself. As indicated here, the received mailbox identifier is matched to a stored mailbox identifier. Yet, the claim continues by indicating that the matching identifies the generated PUID. The identified PUID allows "*accessing the first subscriber profile information based on the identified*

generated first PUID and accessing the second subscriber profile information based on the identified generated second PUID." The PUIDs identify the first and second subscriber profile information. Again, the PUIDs allows for the rich mapping capabilities. This is not taught in any manner in Porter. The claim language makes clear that the first and second subscriber profiles are different than the PUIDs. With regard to PhoneWorks, applicants cannot find any teaching or suggestion of PUIDs that includes the features as indicated in the claim.

Independent claim 34 further recites "*sending the alert via the at least one communication channel indicated in the first subscriber profile information that is identified by the generated first PUID and sending the alert via the at least one communication channel indicated in the second subscriber profile information that is identified by the generated second PUID.*" In Porter, the subscriber profile information is not identified by generated PUIDs. Again, the direct mapping of Porter does not provide the rich mapping and versatility as indicated above. With regard to PhoneWorks, applicants cannot find any teaching or suggestion of PUIDs that includes the features as indicated in the claim. Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claim 34 is allowable.

With regard to the dependent claims, the dependent claims include features that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. Furthermore, those claims ultimately depend from the independent claims set forth above. As such, they should be found allowable for at least those same reasons.

III.   Request for Reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

_____
RYAN T. GRACE
Registration No. 52,956
Direct Dial: 402.344.3000

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

> **27488**
> PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

15